

**MINUTES**  
**SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting – April 24, 2009**  
**DPLU Hearing Room, 9:00 a.m.**

The meeting convened at 9:07 a.m., recessed at 10:40 a.m., reconvened at 11:02 a.m. and adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

**A. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners Present:** Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Advisors Present:** Goralka, Lantis, Sinsay (OCC); Taylor (OCC)

**Staff Present:** Farace, Gibson, Giffen, Real, Steinhoff, Murphy, Jones (recording secretary)

**B. Statement of Planning Commission's Proceedings, Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of April 10, 2009**

**Action:** Riess - Brooks

Approve the Minutes of April 10, 2009.

Ayes: 7 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods  
Noes: 0 - None  
Abstain: 0 - None  
Absent: 0 - None

**C. Public Communication:** Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Commission on any subject matter within the Commission's jurisdiction but not an item on today's Agenda.

There were none.

**D. Announcement of Handout Materials Related to Today's Agenda Items**

**E. Requests for Continuance**

**F. Formation of Consent Calendar**

**Administrative:**

**G. Director's Report:**

- **Open Space Easement Signage Language**

This proposal to amend standard condition language pertaining to open space signage is postponed to the May 8, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

- **Results of Board of Supervisors Hearing(s) on Items Previously Considered by the Planning Commission**

At their April 22, 2009 meeting, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Planning Commission's February 13, 2009 recommendations that the Board approve Staff's proposed revisions to the Secondary Dwelling and Accessory Dwelling Units Ordinances (POD 08-005). The Board of Supervisors also accepted Staff's report on the Service First Initiative.

**TM 5511RPL<sup>3</sup>, S07-019 Agenda Item 1:**

1. **KRS Development, Tentative Map (TM) 5511RPL<sup>3</sup> and Site Plan S07-019, Borrego Springs Community Plan Area** (continued from February 13, 2009)

Requested Vesting Tentative Map to subdivide a 50.69-acre property into 17 single-family residential lots of at least 2 acres each, along with one 11.6 acre commercial lot. The project site is located West of Hoberg Road and north of Palm Canyon Drive, abutting Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, in the unincorporated community of Borrego Springs. No extension of sewer or water utilities will be required by the project, and no development is currently proposed for the commercially zoned lot. Such development will be required to be approved under a subsequent Site Plan.

**Staff Presentation:** Taylor

**Proponents:** 0; **Opponents:** 0

It is requested that this proposal be remanded back to Staff to allow further discussions with representatives of the Borrego Springs Fire Protection District.

**Action:** Riess - Pallinger

Return TM 5511RPL<sup>3</sup> and S07-019 to Staff for further resolution of fire service requirements. Staff will reschedule this Item for consideration by the Planning Commission when appropriate.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

**TM 5511RPL<sup>3</sup>, S07-019 Agenda Item 1:**

**2. Public Road Standards, Countywide**

**Proposed revisions to the San Diego County Public Road Standards. These standards establish design and construction requirements for public roads located within the unincorporated area of San Diego County. These standards apply to County-initiated public road improvement projects as well as privately-initiated public road improvement projects. Improvements to public roads are often required as conditions of land development (discretionary permit) approval.**

**Staff Presentation:** Goralka

**Proponents:** 0; **Opponents:** 6

Staff is commended for reviewing the Road Standards, proposing to include roundabouts, and proposing revisions to the existing standards for intersections. Commissioner Pallinger recently learned that the Bonsall Sponsor Group members believe they did not have adequate time to review or comment on these proposals. Staff acknowledges that the Group did not provide comments, but reminds the Commissioners that the proposed revisions were publicly circulated for 60 days.

In response to Commissioner Beck's inquiries as to whether customized road standards in the various communities could be impacted by these revisions, and whether consideration was given to customizing the road standards for the town centers and villages in the Community Plan Areas, Staff explains that the standards were not customized for specific locations, but they do offer some flexibility.

Commissioner Riess recommends that the Planning and Sponsor Group representatives be notified of revisions that could possibly impact their communities or result in inconsistencies with Community Plan goals. Staff clarifies that community right-of-way development standards for each Planning Area are being developed. Chairman Woods is very supportive of this action.

Representatives of the Valley Center Community Planning Group and the Valley Center Design Review Board (DRB) are somewhat supportive of some of Staff's proposed revisions, but are quite concerned that there is no appeal process. They provide photographic evidence that road improvements can sometimes

**Administrative:**

greatly change the character of a community. Commissioner Day reminds these members of the audience that Planning/Sponsor Group and Design Review Board representatives are always able to present their concerns to the Planning Commission.

Members of the audience urge the Planning Commission to form a subcommittee with members of the Valley Center Planning Group, the DRB and the Bonsall Sponsor Group, as well as other interested parties, to ensure that road standards don't destroy the characters of these rural communities. They remind the Planning Commission that the road standards are currently somewhat uniform throughout the unincorporated areas; they believe there should be options and flexibility that specifically reflects the communities the roads impact. For instance, some communities don't need wider roads or additional lanes. The options should address issues such as how to narrow right-of-ways, provisions for bike lanes, and allow varied road material options.

Following public testimony, the Planning Commissioners agree all of the issues raised are valid and warrant further discussion, and concur that a subcommittee must be formed to address them.

**Action:** Day - Riess

Discussions on the proposed road standards are continued to June 19, 2009. Commissioners Brooks, Norby and Riess will represent the Planning Commission on a Road Standards subcommittee to address the issues raised today. Commissioners Beck and Pallinger will serve as alternates.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

**TM 5511RPL<sup>3</sup>, S07-019 Agenda Item 1:**

**3. Amendments to Planning Commission Policy PC-2**

Proposed minor revisions to Planning Commission Policy PC-2 pertaining to "Planning Commission Procedural Rules for Conduct of Zoning and Planning Hearings". The proposed amendments consist of revisions to submission of writings to the Planning Commission by now allowing submissions two days prior to the Planning Commission hearing; clarification on the matter of continuance of public hearings; clarification of the public notice requirements; and other minor changes.

**Staff Presentation:** Farace

**Proponents:** 0; **Opponents:** 0

Due to time constraints, it is recommended that these proposed revisions are postponed to the Planning Commission's next meeting.

**Action:** Pallinger - Brooks

Continue consideration of the proposed revisions to Planning Commission Policy PC-2 to the meeting of May 8, 2009.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

**Access Requirements, Agenda Item 4:**

**4. Access Requirements for Wildfires**

Staff will provide a presentation covering dead-end road regulations, the County's approach to reviewing projects, an example of projects that successfully identified mitigation measures resulting in the 'same practical effect' and the status of projects in-house and measures being taken.

**Staff Presentation:** Murphy, Steinhoff

**Proponents:** 1; **Opponents:** 7

**Discussion:**

Staff reviews the California Code of Regulations, and explains that review of projects includes evaluation of fire protection plans that includes details such as fire service response time, water availability, ignition resistive construction, vegetation management and access to/from development sites. Staff also reviews the reasons for the developer's inability to provide secondary access, whether it is possible to deviate from the road standards, in addition to numerous of other conditions, such as the condition of the existing road, maintenance agreements, right-of-way adequacy, road length. Staff evaluates the project location, vegetation type onsite and offsite, wind orientation and fire history, as well as who will provide water service, what the response time is, how many stations can respond in an emergency, whether the responders are career service providers or volunteers, and vegetation management enforcement. Staff explains that there are currently 517 pending development projects inhouse; 125 of those exceed the dead-end road length but there are possible solutions for 90 of those. There have been no workable solutions determined for 35 of the 125. Staff emphasizes that the incorrect handling of access requirements endangers the lives of residents and emergency responders.

Many of the speakers in today's audience believe an appeal process should be implemented for applicants whose projects are deemed unworkable due to lack of or an inability to meet access requirements. These speakers consider shelter-in-place development a viable alternative for meeting fire safety requirements, but are reminded by other speakers today that shelter-in-place is a last resort plan.

**Access Requirements, Agenda Item 4:**

Commissioner Day explains that secondary access provisions is a State requirement with which all land developers must comply. The County of San Diego and land developers must also ensure that property owners are afforded certain protection. Commissioner Day agrees that the review process must be consistent, uniform and transparent. He is interested in further discussions regarding the fire board of appeals, as mentioned by an audience member today, but is informed by Staff that there is no such body; Staff merely confers with a group of individuals who are knowledgeable about fire codes. However, to alleviate concerns and address this issue, Staff will include the applicant's consultants in these discussions.

Commissioner Beck advises Staff to focus this same intensity on this issue when discussions on the open space subdivision in the County's General Plan is discussed, and ensure that impacts on community character, biology and the MSCP are addressed.

Commissioner Pallinger commends Staff for the presentation today. He explains to the audience that, while he greatly supports property rights, land development is a discretionary process with the inherent risk of projects sometimes being denied. He also advises the audience that neither he nor his fellow Commissioners believe t property owners should be given false hope, but if Staff cannot find a solution, the applicants should be allowed to present their cases to the Commission.

**Action:** Pallinger - Day

Staff is to return to the Planning Commission on September 18, 2009 with an update on the projects discussed today that were found to be unsolvable with respect to secondary access requirements and the various options.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Norby, Pallinger, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None



**Administrative:**

**H. Report on actions of Planning Commission's Subcommittees:**

There were none.

**I. Designation of member to represent the Planning Commission at Board of Supervisors meeting(s):**

No Items considered by the Planning Commission are scheduled for hearings at the next Board of Supervisors meeting.

**J. Discussion of correspondence received by the Planning Commission:**

None.

**K. Scheduled Meetings:**

May 8, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 22, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 5, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 19, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 10, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 24, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 7, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 21, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 4, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 19, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 2, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 16, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

**Administrative:**

October 30, 2009	Planning Commission Workshop, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 13, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 4, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 18, 2009	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

There being no further business to be considered at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on May 8, 2009 in the DPLU Hearing Room, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California.